

REMARKS

Claims 3-16, 29-36 and 50-55 are pending herein. Claim 1-2, 17-28, and 37-49 are canceled. Claims 50-55 are new.

I. The obviousness rejections of claims 1-36 based on Keane (US Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0003342A1), at page 3 of the Office Action.

The USPTO respectfully rejects claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Keane. Claims 3, 4, 15, 16, and 29 are the independent claims.

A. Keane does not teach or suggest an image forming apparatus which is configured as a single device, as claimed in claims 3, 4, 15, and 16.

Claims 3, 4, 15, and 16 claim in relevant part:

“An image forming apparatus which is **configured as one device** and capable of being connected to a portable communication terminal carryable by a user.”
(emphasis added herein)

No new matter is added by the amendments. Support for the amendments is found in the original claims and Figures 2, 7, 17 of the present specification. Regarding these limitations, it is respectfully not seen where the cited references teach or suggest the claimed structure quoted above.

For example, the USPTO respectfully argues on page 3 of the Office Action that Keane teaches an image forming apparatus comprising: a storing section, an image forming section, a connector, a communication control section, communicating with a server, an obtaining section, a first selecting section, and wherein the apparatus provides the first data and the second data in the output state selected by the first selecting section.

However, Keane does not teach or suggest that these structures are configured as one device, as claimed in claims 3, 4, 15 and 16. Instead, as seen in the specification at Figures 1 and paragraphs [0009] and [0017], **Keane teaches three distinct separate systems of “PC Storage”, “Central Data Storage” and “Printer Data Storage” to provide a system to print business cards and the like from a customer through the internet.** Thus, Keane does not disclose or suggest the image forming

apparatus which is configured as one device according to the present independent claims 3, 4, 15, and 16.

In contrast, in the system of present claims 3, 4, 15, and 16, **the image forming apparatus is configured as one device**. That is, the image forming apparatus 110 of claims 3, 4, 15 and 16 comprises a reading section 116, an image forming section 117, a connector 1120a, a communication control section 130, an obtaining section 115, a first selecting section, a control section 1120 wherein the device provides the user with first data and printed matter of the second data as one device.

For example, see Figs. 2, 7 and 17 and page 39 lines 8-17 and page 41, line 8 to page 51 line 24 of the present specification which show the image forming apparatus which obtains various types of data, stores the data in a storage medium, or prints and outputs the data, and provides the storage medium or printing matter for the user configured as a single device.

The distinction noted above is important and non-trivial because it results in significant advantages over conventional structures. For example, an image forming apparatus having all the devices combined is more convenient for the consumer because it keeps all the devices and multimedia formats in one location.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that Keane does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 3, 4, 15, and 16. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that claims 3, 4, 15 and 16 are allowable over Keane.

B. Keane does not teach or suggest an image forming apparatus, which automatically distributes article data on the receiving desired date of the user based on an electronic key, as claimed in independent claim 29.

Independent Claim 29 claims in relevant part:

“an article database for storing electronic data of a plurality of articles;

a first storage for storing a receiving desired date, an information destination, and an extract condition, in a state of each of the receiving desired date, the informing destination, and the extract condition being corresponding to each user, and for storing a plurality of pieces provided article data and accounts related to the plurality of provide article data respectively

therein, in a state where each of the plurality of pieces of provided article data corresponds to an electronic key; and

a control section for extracting the provided article data from the article database based on the extract condition before the receiving desired data,”
(emphasis added herein)

No new matter is added by the amendments. Support for the amendments is found at page 80 line 4 to page 83 line 3 in the original specification and Figure 10 of the present specification. Regarding these limitations, it is respectfully not seen where the cited references teach or suggest the claimed structure quoted above.

For example, the USPTO respectfully argues on page 3 of the Office Action that Keane teaches an image forming apparatus comprising: a storing section, an image forming section, a connector, a communication control section, communicating with a server, an obtaining section, a first selecting section, and wherein the apparatus provides the first data and the second data in the output state selected by the first selecting section.

However, Keane respectfully does not teach or suggest at all an image forming apparatus which automatically distributes article data on the desired receiving date based on an electronic key according to the present claim 29.

In contrast, in present claim 29, **the image forming system extracts and automatically provides article data based on the extract condition before the desired receiving date of the user.** Present Fig. 10 shows at least one possible embodiment of the claimed structure quoted above. For example, the registered user table 2522 in Fig. 10 stores the electronic mail address and the receiving desired date to which the electronic key is sent so as to inform that the publication can be provided.

Therefore, the image forming system of claim 29 comprises a server with a control section for extracting the provided article data from the article database based on the extract condition before the receiving desired date, for generating the electronic key, and for storing the extracted provided article data in the storage so that each piece of the extracted provided article corresponds to the electronic key.

The distinction noted above is also important and non-trivial because it results in significant advantages over conventional structures. For example, an image forming apparatus

which automatically distributes article data on the receiving date of the user based on an electronic key, gives the consumer the convenience of being able to select media at a location other than the location of the image forming apparatus.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that Keane does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 29. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that claim 29 is not obvious over Keane.

C. The dependent claims.

As noted above, it is respectfully asserted that independent claims 3, 4, 15, 16 and 29 are allowable, and therefore it further respectfully asserted that dependent claims 5-14, 30-36 and 50-55 are also allowable.

New dependent claims 50-53 directly correspond to claims 11-14. No new matter is added.

II. Conclusion.

Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Please contact the undersigned for any reason. Applicants seek to cooperate with the Examiner including via telephone if convenient for the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Daniel P. Lent/
Daniel P. Lent
Registration No. 44,867

Date: June 30, 2008
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413